

SECTION J – LIST OF ATTACHMENTS
J.17 – PAST PERFORMANCE PACKAGE

Past Performance Questionnaire

Background Information (for person filling out the survey):

Name:	Rank and Service, if Military:
Title:	Organization:
Phone (commercial, not DSN):	FAX:
E-Mail Address:	Dates of Involvement From: To:
Mailing Address:	

Contract Information (for the contract involved):

Company Being Rated:	Division, if any:
Contract Number:	Award Date:
Brief Description of Work, Including End Items and/or Significant Products Delivered: Complete <input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/>	
Major Design and Significant Testing Milestones (Ex: Preliminary Design Review, Critical Design Review, Acceptance, Integration - list only those which have occurred in the past 5 years):	
Original Contract Value: Current Contract Value: If different, clarify how much of the change is due to customer requirements/schedule changes and how much is due to contractor overrun:	
Would you recommend the contractor for similar work? Why?	
List any of this company's contracts you are aware of requiring similar capabilities.	
Signature:	Date:

Based on your knowledge of the contract identified above, please provide your assessment of how well the contractor performed on each of the following topics. Only performance in the past five (5) years is relevant. **Please check the appropriate rating and comment on all responses other than those rated Satisfactory or N/A.**

PART III – LIST OF DOCUMENTS, EXHIBITS AND OTHER ATTACHMENTS
SECTION J – LIST OF ATTACHMENTS
J.17 – PAST PERFORMANCE PACKAGE

Performance Rating Definitions:

Outstanding (O)	Indicates performance clearly exceeded requirements. Area of evaluation contains few minor problems for which corrective action appears highly effective.
Good (G)	Indicates performance exceeded some requirements. Area of evaluation contains few minor problems for which corrective action appears effective.
Satisfactory (S)	Indicates performance meets contractual requirements. The area of evaluation contains some minor problems for which the corrective actions appear satisfactory.
Marginal (M)	Indicates performance meets contractual requirements. The area of evaluation contains a serious problem for which corrective actions have not yet been identified, appear only marginally effective, or have not been fully implemented.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Indicates the contractor is in danger of not being able to satisfy contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The area of evaluation contains serious problems for which the corrective actions appear ineffective.
Neutral (N)	Neutral or Unknown

Systems Engineering

How well did the contractor perform requirements analysis and definition?	O	G	S	M	U	N
How well did the contractor perform functional analysis and allocation?	O	G	S	M	U	N
How well did the contractor perform system concept development?	O	G	S	M	U	N
How well did the contractor's software development process work?	O	G	S	M	U	N
How effective was their interface management and control?	O	G	S	M	U	N
How well did they manage technical risk?	O	G	S	M	U	N
Did the contractor maintain a disciplined discrepancy reporting system that identified, tracked, and reported discrepancies and detailed their resolution?	O	G	S	M	U	N
Did the contractor's qualification/acceptance program identify and correct manufacturing defects?	O	G	S	M	U	N
Was the contractor innovative in designing commonality and flexibility into the system?	O	G	S	M	U	N
Did they identify investments that saved cost or schedule over the life of the program?	O	G	S	M	U	N
How would you rate the contractor's overall performance in this area?	O	G	S	M	U	N

Additional Comments:

[illegible]

Did the system meet all mission requirements?	O	G	S	M	U	N
How well did the contractor utilize commercial components to minimize risk?	O	G	S	M	U	N
Where required, did contractor conduct supplemental testing and validation to adequately mitigate risk?	O	G	S	M	U	N
Were the contractor's facilities adequate?	O	G	S	M	U	N
Did the contractor's verification processes and test programs identify and correct all defects before they affected mission success?	O	G	S	M	U	N
Was the support equipment adequate throughout the program?	O	G	S	M	U	N
Did the contractor execute a viable operational concept for the installation and checkout of the support equipment?	O	G	S	M	U	N
Was the contractor flexible and successful in implementing requirements changes during the course of the program?	O	G	S	M	U	N
How would you rate the contractor's overall performance in this area?	O	G	S	M	U	N

[illegible]

PART III – LIST OF DOCUMENTS, EXHIBITS AND OTHER ATTACHMENTS
SECTION J – LIST OF ATTACHMENTS
J.17 – PAST PERFORMANCE PACKAGE

Program Management

Did the contractor demonstrate sufficient flexibility to accommodate surges in the number of tasks being supported simultaneously as well as maintaining critical skills during periods with limited activity in a cost effective manner?	O	G	S	M	U	N
Did the contractor adequately staff key positions with personnel that had the requisite experience/education to successfully complete the effort?	O	G	S	M	U	N
Did the contractor provide adequate technical and financial insight for the Government and its Systems Engineering and Technical Assistance contractor(s) through the use of design reviews, technical interchange meetings, program reviews, etc.?	O	G	S	M	U	N
Did the contractor propose realistic schedules that they were able to meet without program delays?	O	G	S	M	U	N
How well did the contractor apply their Earned Value Management Control System? Was data timely, accurate, and utilized by the contractor as a Program Management tool?	O	G	S	M	U	N
Did the contractor comply with applicable SOW requirements, avoiding extensive tailoring and waivers that led to negative impacts to the program?	O	G	S	M	U	N
Did the contractor's risk management approach provide a means of identifying initial risk, adding new risks as they arise, assessing their criticality, tracking and reporting them and developing processes for mitigation?	O	G	S	M	U	N
How well did the contractor manage the team of sub-contractors/vendors?	O	G	S	M	U	N
Were organizational conflicts of interest resolved adequately during the program?	O	G	S	M	U	N
How well did the contractor contain program costs over the life of the program?	O	G	S	M	U	N
How well did the contractor meet or beat the schedule over the life of the program?	O	G	S	M	U	N
Did the contractor propose realistic goals and provide a reasonable amount of any subcontracted effort to small businesses?	O	G	S	M	U	N
How would you rate the contractor's overall performance in this area?	O	G	S	M	U	N

Additional Comments:

PART III – LIST OF DOCUMENTS, EXHIBITS AND OTHER ATTACHMENTS
SECTION J – LIST OF ATTACHMENTS
J.17 – PAST PERFORMANCE PACKAGE

PART III – LIST OF DOCUMENTS, EXHIBITS AND OTHER ATTACHMENTS
SECTION J – LIST OF ATTACHMENTS
J.17 – PAST PERFORMANCE PACKAGE

Transmittal Letter to Accompany Past Performance Questionnaire [TO BE COMPLETED BY OFFEROR]
--

RFP NO. HSCG23-08-R-ADA011

MEMORANDUM FOR: [OFFEROR'S POC]

FROM: [OFFEROR'S ADDRESS AND POINT OF CONTACT]

SUBJECT: Present/Past Performance Questionnaire for Contract(s) _____.

1. We are currently responding to the United States Coast Guard Request For Proposal (RFP) HSCG23-08-R-ADA011 for the procurement of the Nationwide Automatic Identification System (NAIS) Increment 2 Phase 1. This RFP specifically requires that we, as an Offeror, do the following:

Send out a Past Performance Questionnaire to each of the Offeror's critical subcontractors', teaming subcontractors' and/or joint venture partners' Points of Contact (POCs). The responsibility to send out the Past Performance Questionnaires rests solely with the Offeror - i.e., it shall not be delegated to any subcontractors, team contractors, and/or joint venture partners. The Offeror shall exert its best efforts to ensure that at least two (2) POCs, per relevant contract, submit a completed Present/Past Performance Questionnaire **directly to the Government not later than the proposal due date specified in Box 9 of the SF33**. Each of the Offeror's POC's shall **telefax** its completed Present/Past Performance Questionnaire directly to:

United States Coast Guard HQ
Attn: Ms. Kerri Williams, CG-9124
2100 Second Street, SW
Jemal Building, Room 11-0703
Washington D.C. 20593
Phone: (202) 475-3298
Fax: (202) 475-3912

Mailing the questionnaire(s) to the address above is an acceptable alternative method of transmission. If mailing, the outside envelope must be marked as follows:

NOTE: TO BE OPENED BY ADDRESSEE ONLY
SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - See FAR 3.104
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

2. We have identified the subject contract(s) as relevant to this acquisition. You have been identified as our POC. As such, please take a few moments of your time to fill out the attached questionnaire and return it directly to Mrs. Kerri Williams the Contracting Officer for the NAIS requirement. The information contained in the completed Past Performance Questionnaire is considered sensitive and cannot be released to us, the Offeror. If you have any questions about the acquisition or the attached questionnaire, your questions must be directed back to the Contracting Officer identified above. Thank you for your timely assistance.

Sincerely,

[OFFEROR'S POINT OF CONTACT]

Attachment(s)
Past Performance Questionnaire